

41(a)(1)(A)(ii). Because Plaintiffs' notice is improper under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, dismissal is **DENIED**.

Additionally, because a minor is involved, this Court might need to serve “as arbiter to decide in the case of [the] minor’s claim what is fair and reasonable and *in the best interest of the minor*.” Dean v. Holiday Inns, Inc., 860 F.2d 670, 673 (6th Cir. 1988) (emphasis in original). If a settlement was reached between the Parties, then “[f]airness of the settlement must be determined by the trial court . . . since [minors] are unable to care for themselves, [they] deserve the court’s protection.” Id. (quoting Centala v. Navrude, 186 N.W.2d 35, 36 (Mich. Ct. App. 1971)). District courts would be “remiss if [they did not make] an independent determination that the settlement was in the minor’s best interest.” Green v. Nevers, 111 F.3d 1295, 1301 (6th Cir. 1997). Thus, the Parties are **ORDERED** to disclose whether a settlement was reached with the minor, W.M.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 6th day of February, 2024.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman
SHERYL H. LIPMAN
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE